

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 10 June 2021 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, Colin Churchman, Mike Fletcher, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley, Lee Watson and Abbie Akinbohun (Substitute) (substitute for James Halden)

Steve Taylor, Campaign to Protect Rural England Representative

Apologies: Councillor James Halden

In attendance:

Leigh Nicholson, Assistant Director of Planning, Transport and Public Protection
Jonathan Keen, Interim Strategic Lead of Development Services
Matthew Gallagher, Major Applications Manager
Ian Harrison, Principal Planner
Nadia Houghton, Principal Planner
Chris Purvis, Major Applications Manager
Julian Howes, Senior Highway Engineer
Caroline Robins, Locum Solicitor
Wendy Le, Senior Democratic Services Officer

Before the start of the meeting, all present were advised that the meeting was being live streamed and recorded, with the video recording to be made available on the Council's website.

1. Minutes

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 22 April 2021 were approved as a true and correct record.

2. Item of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

The Chair informed the Committee that planning application 20/00284/OUT had been fully withdrawn by the Applicant.

3. Declaration of Interests

Councillor Churchman declared an interest on 20/00592/OUT in that he had family and friends who were members of The Springhouse Club. He confirmed that he would not participate in the item.

Steve Taylor declared that he was a member of The Springhouse Club.

4. Declarations of receipt of correspondence and/or any meetings/discussions held relevant to determination of any planning application or enforcement action to be resolved at this meeting

The Chair declared on behalf of the Committee that emails had been received by a resident, Beverley Johnston, and by the agent, Jennifer Wrayton on planning application 21/00243/FUL. Councillor Polley declared that she had received emails on the same application.

5. Planning Appeals

There were no questions or comments from Members.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

6. 2020/21 Planning Performance Report

The Chair asked that officers update Members outside of Committee on s106 contributions for applications that had been approved at Committee.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

7. 20/00430/FUL - Coach Park, Pilgrims Lane, North Stifford, Grays, Essex, RM16 5UZ

The report was presented by Ian Harrison.

Councillor Fletcher noted that the report mentioned that the traffic movements on the site would be reduced and asked what the Applicant was comparing these traffic movements to. He said that there was not much traffic movement that was current going in and out of the site. Ian Harrison explained that the Applicant had based this on the full capacity of the coach and car park if it had been used. Councillor Fletcher commented that this approach was theoretical and questioned if this same approach had been used in the previous application for a three year permission. Ian Harrison said that the previous application had never been determined and this current application had been amended to seek permission for five years.

Steve Taylor commented that the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) route was not determined yet and that this site was not near the route either. He asked why the site was chosen by Highways England and reasons for a five year temporary use of the site. Ian Harrison confirmed that the site was not near the proposed LTC route but the site was unused land which was why the

Applicant had chosen this instead of a Green Belt site. The site would be used to investigate and monitor the LTC route for a temporary five year period.

Councillor Piccolo questioned how close the exit of the site to the main road was. Julian Howes answered that the exit of the site was past the roundabout on the main road.

Councillor Polley questioned if the site would be returned to its original use after the end of the five year permission. She raised concerns that the site was close to an area where there was a lot of traffic movement and asked what type of vehicles would be going in and out of the site. She mentioned that there had been large vehicles used on the site before for piling work and that there had been an accident involving a crane previously. Ian Harrison answered that the site would revert back to its original use after the five year permission ended. He said that the site would use contracted larger vehicles. Julian Howes added that the site had been used by the A13/M25 group for construction purposes two or three years ago.

Councillor Byrne pointed out that the traffic around the site would increase the traffic issues around area and sought more detail. Julian Howes answered that most of the traffic would be outside of the peak hours so would not worsen the traffic around the area. He said that the site had been in use for the past 18 months with vehicles going in and out of the site which had not increased the traffic around the area.

Councillor Piccolo sought clarification on the 7am – 7pm traffic monitoring hours and asked if it included peak hours which Julian Howes confirmed that it.

The Vice-Chair agreed with the concerns raised on traffic from Members. He commented that he wished to see a travel plan and that he had seen 40 tonne lorries going into the site. He said that the travel plan needed to include the hours that vehicles were allowed in and out of the site as the area had a lot of traffic. The Chair questioned what the overall traffic movements in and out of the site would be when it was in operation. Julian Howes said that the report detailed the number of trips on the site which did not show a significant increase. He said that the site had been in operation for the past 18 months.

The Chair commented that the site could have been running at a higher capacity back in the 1990s or early 2000s and the site was now outdated as it was no longer used as a coach park. He noted that the estimation of traffic movements was used for approval of the application and sought further details. Ian Harrison explained that the Applicant had assessed the site to be operating currently at 40% capacity. This figure was increased to 100% based on the full capacity of the coach park being operated as a contractors compound which was around 850 vehicle movements a day. He said that the figures highlighted that the vehicle movements would still be less than the number of vehicle movements if the site had been operating as a coach and car park.

Speaker Statements were heard from

- Laura Blake, Thames Crossing Action Group – in objection.
- Sarah Collins, Agent – in support.

Councillor Fletcher asked whether the largest vehicles of 20 tonnes were included in the assessment of traffic movements. He asked how confident the service was in that the large vehicles would not cause an obstruction when turning at the roundabout. He noted that a previous application had been refused and asked what the difference was between this application and the previous one. Julian Howes said that he was unable to confirm this without looking at the Transport Assessment but that all vehicle movements should have been included. He went on to say that there was enough room for larger vehicles to turn at the roundabout but not enough room for vehicles waiting to get into the site at the gates. The Highways Team preferred that the gates to the site be placed further back into the site. Ian Harrison said that the previous application had been for a flower market which would have significantly increased the number of traffic movements in the area so had been refused.

Steve Taylor questioned whether there were restrictions placed on exiting the site. He commented that with the site's location, it could potentially have vehicles using routes in local areas such as Ockendon and questioned if vehicles would be required to use the main road networks. Julian Howes answered that the larger vehicles were required to remain on the strategic road networks and to submit road strategies to the Highways Team for agreement. The Highways Team would look to prevent larger vehicles from using local roads but where it was not possible, vehicles would travel though an alternative route. Steve Taylor pointed out that there were alternative sites such as one between the junction of the A127 and M25 that was set up on the Green Belt to monitor the M25. Julian Howes was unable to confirm if the site had been considered.

Councillor Byrne asked whether the previous application to use the site as a flower market had less than 1,700 vehicle movements. Julian Howes answered that the flower market would have resulted in more vehicle movement in a short period of time as the market had been proposed to open for Sundays. This would have impacted the road networks in one day rather than being spread out.

The Chair began the debate by pointing out that the permission may last longer than five years and potentially be for ten years. He said that the number of traffic movements was high but noted that this would not be upheld in an appeal.

The Vice-Chair highlighted his concerns on the traffic and said that he would prefer to see a travel plan before approving the application to ensure that 40 tonne lorries were not operating between 8am – 9am and 3pm – 5.30pm. He said that the site was five miles from the proposed route of the LTC and that there were other sites that could be used which were closer to the route.

Councillor Byrne pointed out that when the site had been in operation as a coach park, there were no traffic movements. He said that coaches dropped people off and then stayed in the coach park for the majority the day. Councillor Fletcher said that the travel plan was needed and that the issue was about the size of the traffic. He said there were traffic concerns around the Pilgrims Lane roundabout and lesson the roundabout by Sainsburys. He was concerned that traffic would be impacted in areas such as Ockendon. Councillor Polley said that the application was premature as the LTC route had not been confirmed yet. She highlighted her concerns on the smaller entrance in to the Pilgrims Lane's traveller site and that the residents there had not been consulted. She pointed out that there was still a reduced amount of traffic due to lockdown restrictions still in place but that there were already traffic issues.

(Councillor Akinbohun arrived at 6.55pm)

Councillor Piccolo pointed out that the traffic movements comparison were over 20 years old and was irrelevant as the traffic situation was different with new developments since then. He said that there had not been much work in the site other than exploratory work in the last 18 months and could not consider the traffic movements in this time to be a representative of what it would be for the site if approved. He felt that the site's exit was too close to the A1306 and vehicles exiting the site would cause a blockage to the approach road and increase the traffic congestion. He pointed out that the access was not appropriate and needed to be placed further from the roundabout.

Councillor Watson also highlighted concerns about traffic and said that it was frequently busy throughout the week. She felt that a robust travel plan was needed too.

Jonathan Keen summarised Members' points and said that the site's use was a coach park. If the application was not approved, the site could continue to operate as a coach park with vehicles going in and out of the site. He referred Members to condition two in the report and said that it required that the travel plan be submitted within two months of approval. If not, the use of the coach park would cease. He reassured Members that the travel plan would be assessed by the Highways Team and consider Members' comments particularly on HGV routing on the strategic road network. A condition could also be added to limit the hours of movement for HGVs in and out of the site. There was scope within the application to limit the movement of vehicles. He noted Members' concerns of the site's location and said that the site was an existing established site within the area and that if the use was not permitted for this site, the Applicant could potentially look to a site on the Green Belt.

Councillor Fletcher asked whether the application would come back to a committee meeting if the application was approved subject to a travel plan. Jonathan Keen explained that if the application was approved, the conditions would not come back to Committee as it was not within the terms of reference of Planning Committee. He said that Members would be able to see the

conditions once they were drafted as it was a public document. He reassured Members that their concerns would be addressed in the travel plan and that the conditions were enforceable.

Councillor Piccolo commented that the traffic from the site needed to be controlled. He suggested traffic lights as a form of control. Jonathan Keen said that the gates could be used as a way of controlling traffic out of the site.

Councillor Watson proposed deferring the application so that Members could see the travel plan. Councillor Piccolo seconded this.

(In line with the Constitution, Chapter 5, Part 3(d), para. 13.5, Councillor Akinbohun was unable to participate and vote on this item as she had not been present at the start of the item.)

FOR: (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, Colin Churchman, Mike Fletcher, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley, Lee Watson.

AGAINST: (0)

ABSTAINED: (0)

8. 20/00592/OUT - The Springhouse, Springhouse Road, Corringham, Essex, SS17 7QT

The report was presented by Chris Purvis. He informed Committee that there had been an update to the Essex RAMs payment outlined in recommendation B. He said that the new payment was now £12,093.30 as this was increased due to the new financial year.

The Chair thanked Members who had attended the site visit on Wednesday 9 June. In regards to the football pitches, he asked if these were managed by the Applicant and asked why these were not used. He also asked if permission was needed to access the pitches. Chris Purvis answered that the football pitches were maintained by the Applicant and that the pitches shown on photos were from five years ago. He said that the Applicant had informed that the pitches could be used and reinstalled if needed but this area was outside of the application site's proposal. To access the site, he said that permission would be needed from the landowner.

The Chair said that more parking spaces were needed and also acknowledged that more green spaces were needed. He asked why the service had requested for more green spaces instead of parking on the proposal. Chris Purvis explained that the site needed a mixed balance of amenity and green space, and to create a better visual appearance rather than the development being parking dominant aspect. He said that the parking spaces proposed met the Council's draft parking standards.

The Chair pointed out that there were only three visitor parking spaces in the proposal which would cause parking issues. He noted the double stacked parking design and sought more detail. He also asked who would be managing the car parking and what the Council's parking standards were. Chris Purvis indicated on the site plan on where the double stacked parking was proposed to be built. He said that cars would park underground with another car park level on top which required less land use and that there was a planning condition that required full details on this to be provided. He went on to say that there was a car parking management scheme under condition 18 that would require the Applicant to provide the Council with details on the car parking management company. On the Council's parking standards, he explained that the medium accessibility applied in this case which was 1 to 1.25 parking spaces. However, the location of the site was close to the town centre and was considered sustainable so one parking space per dwelling was acceptable.

Councillor Byrne questioned whether the football pitches could be built on in a future planning application. He asked if this land could be protected from development through the planning application that was before the Committee. Chris Purvis answered that the pitches were on private land. He said that if the Applicant proposed to build on this in a future application, there would likely be an objection from Sports England if that sports facility was lost. He said that the site of the football pitches was outside or the red boundary line of the current planning application but could add a planning condition that the football pitches be used as a sport facility only.

Councillor Fletcher asked who had access to the football pitches. He also commented on the lack of car parking spaces as some households would have two cars. Chris Purvis said that the football pitches were within the Applicant's land. Football clubs wishing to use the pitches would have to contact the Applicant as it was private land. On car parking, he explained that the site was centrally located and people would be able to access the site by bus, walking or cycling. Julian Howes added that the current car ownership from the National Census was 0.75 car parking spaces per flat.

The Chair noted that the site was centrally located and pointed out that there was only a bus route and the site was not close to the train station. He felt that parking issues would likely arise in the local area with the development. He asked if there were mitigation measures in place for this. He commented that people could currently park on the road outside the site and this could potentially happen if there were no spaces in the development's car park. He asked whether double yellow lines or Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) would be installed to prevent this from happening. Julian Howes answered that the walk from the train station was 20 minutes and that the area had accessible transport links. He said that the Council had requested that the Applicant contribute towards a car club and potentially, a number of the parking spaces would be put towards this. He went on to say that the site was within a medium accessible area and although there was a concern of two cars in a household, the parking standards were based on a normal capacity assessment and not at full capacity. He explained that there were public

parking facilities around the area of the site and that the car park would not always be at full capacity.

Referring to paragraph 6.29, Councillor Polley sought clarification on the two way traffic movements and if it included weekends. She commented that double stack parking was expensive and the application may come back to review this. She also asked who would manage the parking enforcement. Julian Howes said that the traffic movements were based on peak morning and evening hours when traffic was worse as more people would leave or enter the site at the peak hours.

Councillor Polley pointed out that the west of the borough was constantly busy as it was close to the M25 and A13. She commented that, if the football pitches were to be used, it would generate a lot of traffic particularly on Sunday mornings and that car clubs did not always work with certain organisations. Julian Howes said that Sunday traffic movements were generally not worse than the traditional peak hour traffic on 8am – 9am and 5pm – 6pm on weekdays. This was due to people going to work or coming home from work and taking children to school in the mornings.

Councillor Polley asked what was considered to be a significant loss of light (in relation to Dove Court); where the electric gate was positioned; and if there was an emergency vehicle access road for the gated development. Julian Howes said that the gates were expected to be set back from the highway to allow enough room for vehicle waiting to get into the development. Chris Purvis added that more details on the gate would be secured through condition 15. Regarding the loss of light, he said that the proposed building closest to Dove Court was set back from the boundary between the site by eight to nine metres. This would not have a material impact on Dove Court that would warrant a refusal of the application. He stated that the daylight and sunlight assessment also supported this.

The Chair commented that the electric gates would need to be set further back into the site. He said that visitors trying to access the site would need a key fob or be allowed entry into the site so would be waiting for access at the entrance of the gate.

Councillor Piccolo pointed out that the football pitches were not part of the current site application and that the Applicant could decide whether to build on it or not. Referring to the car club, he noted that there would be five or seven vehicles and questioned where these cars would park. Julian Howes answered that the logistics of the car club had not been decided yet. Chris Purvis added that the Transport Manager had asked the Applicant to contribute towards a car club and that the Applicant was willing to work with the service to achieve this.

Councillor Watson asked how many of the 98 proposed car parking spaces was for disabled spaces. She queried if this would mean less parking spaces for the proposed units and what the procedure was for unused disabled spaces. She also asked if an additional 23 spaces would be added to meet

the maximum 1.25 car parking spaces for the Council's parking standards. Julian Howes said that the minimum required for disabled spaces would be allocated out of the proposed 98 car parking spaces. He said that the development met the minimum car parking standards in the Council's parking standards. Chris Purvis added that, as part of the car parking management plan, if the spaces were not required for disabled purposes, these could be used for other purposes. The site plan indicated 12 disabled parking spaces.

Referring to the contributions listed in recommendation B, Councillor Akinbohun asked if these were enough to mitigate the impact of the development to the area. Chris Purvis answered that consultees through the consultation process had identified that these contributions were required to mitigate the impacts of the development for it to be considered acceptable.

Speaker Statements were heard from:

- Janet Littmoden, resident in objection to the application.
- Shane Ralph, ward councillor in objection to the application.
- Russell Barnes, agent in support of the application.

The Chair started the debate by saying that the development was a community benefit and would have improved facilities. However, he was concerned that there development did not have enough provide enough parking spaces and would result in parking issues which would bring in the instalment of double yellow lines and CPZs. He pointed out that the car club and double stack parking already indicated that there were not enough car parking spaces.

Councillor Byrne said that he been at the site on Saturday morning to look at the traffic issues and found that there was not much traffic during that time. He said that there were more traffic issues during the week as the Council had opened a youth offender's centre in the area and had not provided parking for visitors and staff who were parking along Springhouse Road. He agreed with the Chair that more parking was needed on the site. He noted that the agent's speaker statement mentioned that the application was community focused and felt that funds could be diverted into Corringham's local community.

Councillor Fletcher agreed that there was not enough parking spaces. He pointed out that the Springhouse Club car park was not always full but that this would change if the development was built. He noted that the sports facilities would be improved which was welcome but the issue was the number of car parking spaces on the site for the proposed dwellings.

In regards to the car club, Councillor Piccolo said that this needed to be located on the site or next to the site as future residents on the development would not use this if it was located too far. He said that there were good transport links in Thurrock going into London which was good for work but not for going anywhere else. He pointed out that people would travel by car to visit friends and family. He said that the lack of parking was a major concern

for him. He noted that the Applicant proposed more green spaces but pointed out that the site was next a large green space.

The Committee agreed to suspend standing orders at 8.23pm to enable the agenda to be completed.

The Chair proposed recommendation A of the officer's recommendation and was seconded by Councillor Byrne.

FOR: (7) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Abbie Akinbohun, Gary Byrne, Mike Fletcher, Georgette Polley and Lee Watson.

AGAINST: (1) Councillor Terry Piccolo.

ABSTAINED: (0)

Councillor Byrne proposed recommendation B of the officer's recommendation and was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

FOR: (3) Councillors Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne and Lee Watson.

AGAINST: (5) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Abbie Akinbohun, Mike Fletcher, Terry Piccolo and Georgette Polley.

ABSTAINED: (0)

Jonathan Keen referred Members to the Constitution Chapter 5, Part 3 (c), para. 7.2.

The Chair considered proposing a recommendation of refusal on the basis of a lack of parking provision. He said that the development would have an adverse impact on the local road network and lead to the introduction of CPZs in a local economic area that did not currently have CPZs in place. He said that this decision was based on a previous application that had a similar lack of parking spaces proposed. Chris Purvis suggested that Members could defer the application to enable the Applicant to address the issue of the lack of parking spaces in the proposal.

The Chair queried whether there was an option to look further out of the development without encroaching into the green field and keeping the green spaces. He questioned what the potential increase of car parking spaces could be. He said that at least 20 – 30 spaces more would be better. Chris Purvis answered that there was a possibility of 6 to 8 spaces in an area of green space but this would be close to neighbouring residents in some areas of the site. He said that this would be explored and would be within the red line of the site.

The Chair proposed the deferral and Councillor Fletcher seconded.

FOR: (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Abbie Akinbohun, Gary Byrne, Mike Fletcher, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley and Lee Watson.

AGAINST: (0)

ABSTAINED: (0)

The meeting adjourned at 8.36pm and recommenced at 8.43pm.

9. 20/01709/FUL - Land to rear of Bannatynes Sports Centre, Howard Road, Chafford Hundred, Grays

Councillor Akinbohun declared that she had shown pre-determination on this application as she had made her objections to the application publically. Therefore, she would not be participating on the item.

The report was presented by Matthew Gallagher. Since the publication of the agenda, he stated that three further objections had been received which were the same points from other objections outlined within the report. There was also an updated response from the Council's Urban Design Officer. The Applicant had sought to amend the elevation details from the officer's earlier comments on sunlight and daylight issues. However, the officer's objections still largely remained.

Steve Taylor questioned whether the underground parking area shown in the presentation went underneath the block indicated on the plan or if it extended further underneath the site. He also asked if the other side of the old A13 (A1306) was still designated as Green Belt (GB). He highlighted concerns of a ten storey block of flats built on the edge of the GB. Matthew Gallagher answered that the 2009 and 2018 planning permissions included a basement car park. As it was built over 10 years ago, it had been exposed to the elements since then and would require remedial works to resolve this. He indicated on the plan that the basement car park would be partially underneath both of the proposed blocks. He confirmed that the other side of the old A13 was still GB which also had a leisure use on that site. He said that developments did not have to be built on the GB to have a potential impact on the GB. The proposed development could have an effect on the openness of the GB and the Applicant had recognised this and submitted a landscape and visual impact assessment.

Speaker statements were heard from:

- Gemma Lowry, a resident in objection.
- Augustine Ononaji, ward councillor in objection.
- Tim Bell, agent in support.

Councillor Fletcher started the debate by saying that there was too much development and not enough car parking spaces. The Chair said that he had approved the 2017 application that was still live and had a GP surgery.

However, the NHS had deemed that the area was no longer suitable as it did not fulfil their vision. He stated that the proposal had too much development as well.

Councillor Fletcher proposed the officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission and was seconded by the Vice-Chair.

FOR: (8) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Gary Byrne, Colin Churchman, Mike Fletcher, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley and Lee Watson.

AGAINST: (0)

ABSTAINED: (0)

10. 20/00284/OUT - Land West of Lytton Road, River View, Chadwell St Mary, Essex

This application was withdrawn by the Applicant.

11. 21/00243/FUL - Wick Place Cottage, Brentwood Road, Bulphan, Essex, RM14 3TJ

The report was presented by Nadia Houghton.

Speaker statements were heard from:

- Beverley Johnston, a resident in objection.
- Barry Johnson, ward councillor in support.
- James Wiley, agent in support.

Councillor Fletcher sought clarification on whether the smithy was being replaced or restored. Nadia Houghton answered that the smithy would be completely replaced. She said that the footprint of the new smithy was similar to the existing smithy but would be taller in height overall. The materials would be similar but it would be a different structure.

The Chair asked if there had been similar developments in the area. Nadia Houghton answered that she was familiar with the former Pieris Place site that was now the Bonham Grange development. The site had been granted permission in 2015 despite being in the GB but had been identified in the former Development Plan as a potential future site for residential development. There had been a range of Very Special Circumstances (VSC) put forward that had outweighed the harm to the GB in that instance. The application had been consequently recommended for approval because of the VSC including the high quality design materials and the housing supply.

Councillor Polley asked if the smithy building was designated as a heritage asset and what its current use was. Nadia Houghton answered that the building was not listed so was not a heritage building and it was not used as a

smithy. The smithy had been built in the 19th century and was currently used for agricultural storage according to the applicant's plans.

Councillor Byrne sought further clarification on why this application was recommended for refusal when the other application had been recommended for approval and was also on the GB. Jonathan Keen explained that the Pieris Place site had been put forward as a potential housing site as part of the work that was being carried out on the Local Plan at that time. This had been highlighted in a Site Specific Allocations DPD document in 2015. The service had placed some weight on this and in combination with other factors, this tipped the balance over in favour of approval. Applications submitted in the same area and for the current application, could not rely on the same DPD document as those sites including the one in the current allocation had not been identified in that DPD document.

Steve Taylor pointed out that the site in the Pieris Place application had been surrounded by three roads. He said that the current application's site was in an open piece of land that was part of the GB with no roads behind it. The Chair said that approving this application would set a precedence for similar future applications on the GB. Matthew Gallagher explained that the background of the Pieris Place application should not be given weight in this current application. He pointed out that the current application could not be compared against other similar live applications either as each application site was assessed on its merits. However, the Pieris Place site was surrounded by roads on all of its sides and was therefore a more contained and different site in comparison to the current application's site. He highlighted the importance of GB openness and permanence on this current application in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Councillor Fletcher said that a proposed development on the GB needed to be done correctly and given infrastructure which this current application did not have. Councillor Piccolo raised concerns on the harm to the GB if this application was approved particularly where there were live applications on the GB in the area of the site.

Councillor Fletcher proposed the officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission and was seconded by Councillor Watson.

FOR: (9) Councillors Tom Kelly (Chair), Steve Liddiard (Vice-Chair), Abbie Akinbohun, Gary Byrne, Colin Churchman, Mike Fletcher, Terry Piccolo, Georgette Polley, Lee Watson.

AGAINST: (0)

ABSTAINED: (0)

The meeting finished at 10.03 pm

Approved as a true and correct record

CHAIR

DATE

**Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact
Democratic Services at Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk**